

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

United States of America, :
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 v. : Case No. 2:92-cv-0874
 :
 Debra G. Wright, : JUDGE HOLSCHUH
 :
 Defendant. :

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Court set this case for a show cause hearing on May 23, 2005 in order to determine why the defendant should not be held in civil contempt for failing to comply with prior orders of the Court requiring the defendant to appear for a judgment debtor exam. Counsel for the United States and the defendant appeared at the hearing. At the hearing, the defendant executed a declaration concerning assets and liabilities and entered into a payment plan. She acknowledged on the record that the signature on these documents was hers. As a result, the United States agreed that no further contempt proceedings should be pursued. Based upon the foregoing, it is recommended that the order to show cause issued on April 12, 2005 be withdrawn.

PROCEDURE ON OBJECTIONS

If any party objects to this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within ten (10) days of the date of this Report, file and serve on all parties written objections to those specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made, together with supporting authority for the objection(s). A judge of this Court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is

made. Upon proper objections, a judge of this Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made herein, may receive further evidence or may recommit this matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1).

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to have the district judge review the Report and Recommendation de novo, and also operates as a waiver of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the Report and Recommendation. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

/s/ Terence P. Kemp
United States Magistrate Judge